

James X. Bormes
(*pro hac vice* admission pending)
Illinois State Bar No. 620268

Catherine P. Sons
(*pro hac vice* admission pending)
Illinois State Bar No. 6290805

LAW OFFICE OF JAMES X. BORMES, P.C. mmatheson@mathesonlegal.com

Illinois State Bar No. 620268
8 South Michigan Avenue, Suite 2600

Chicago, Illinois 60603
(312) 201-0575

jxbormes@bormeslaw.com

cpsons@bormeslaw.com

LOCAL COUNSEL:

Michelle R. Matheson #019568

MATHESON & MATHESON, P.L.C.

15300 North 90th Street, Suite 550

Scottsdale, Arizona 85260

(480) 889-8951

**LEAD ATTORNEY IN CHARGE FOR
PLAINTIFF AND CLASS MEMBERS**

Thomas M. Ryan

(*pro hac vice* admission pending)

Illinois State Bar No. 6273422

LAW OFFICE OF THOMAS M. RYAN, P.C.

35 East Wacker Drive, Suite 650

Chicago, Illinois 60601

(312) 726-3400

tom@tomryanlaw.com

Attorney for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

IVONNE CARBAJAL, individually and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE HOME DEPOT, INC., a Delaware
Corporation and VALIDITY, INC. a
Delaware Corporation.

Defendants.

Case No.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

1 Plaintiff Ivonne Carbajal, individually and on behalf of all others similarly
2 situated as set forth herein, alleges as follows:

3 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

4 1. Defendants deceptively embedded spy tracking pixels in marketing emails
5 Defendants sent to Plaintiff and other Arizona residents who subscribed to The Home
6 Depot's email list.

7 2. Defendant The Home Depot, Inc. ("Home Depot") utilized the hidden
8 embedded tracking system provided by Defendant Validity, Inc. ("Validity") to collect
9 and track deceptively, among other things, the time and place where Plaintiff and other
10 Arizona residents opened the email, the average read time of an email, the amount of
11 times an email was opened, whether an email was printed, whether an email was
12 forwarded, and how long the recipient looked at the email, the device the recipient used
13 to look at the email and even if and where you clicked within an email. Validity's hidden
14 embedded email tracking pixels monitor Plaintiff and other Arizona residents behavior,
15 stores this collected data to paint a uniquely identifiable detailed picture of Plaintiff and
16 other Arizona residents' interests to create targeted advertising campaigns for Home
17 Depot and presumably other affiliate retailers and service providers.

18 3. This is a class action lawsuit brought on behalf of Arizona residents.

19 4. Plaintiff's claims are brought under Arizona's Telephone, Utility and
20 Communication Service Records Act (A.R.S. § 44-1376 *et seq.*).

21 5. Arizona's Telephone, Utility and Communication Service Records Act
22 prohibits a person from knowingly obtaining a "communication service record" of any
23 Arizona resident i) without the authorization of the person to whom the record pertains
24 or ii) by fraudulent, deceptive or false means. (A.R.S. § 44-1376.01(A)(1).
25

26 6. Plaintiff and the Class members are recipients of Defendant Home Depot's
27 emails that utilize and embed Validity's tracker to obtain, record and collect, *inter alia*,
28 whether and when the email recipients open and read emails from Home Depot, where

1 they open it, how long they looked at it, whether they forwarded it, and how to best target
2 recipients with future emails.

3 7. Defendants never received the Plaintiff's and Class Members' lawful and
4 valid consent to collect, obtain and use this information.

5 8. By failing to receive lawful and valid consent from Plaintiff and the Class
6 Members, Defendants did and are violating Arizona's Telephone, Utility and
7 Communication Service Records Act.

8 **THE PARTIES**

9 9. Plaintiff Ivonne Carbajal is a citizen of Arizona, residing in Maricopa
10 County, Arizona.

11 10. Within the past two years, Plaintiff has frequently received and opened
12 emails from Defendants to review promotional materials.

13 11. Plaintiff most recently opened one of Defendants' emails in March 2024.

14 12. Each time Plaintiff opened an email from Defendants, Defendants procured
15 information identifying her and disclosing when she opened and read the email through
16 the email tracking software embedded in the emails.

17 13. Defendants never received lawful and valid consent from Plaintiff to
18 procure and obtain her private email records or the information Defendants' spy tracker
19 obtained.

20 14. Defendant Home Depot, Inc. is a Delaware corporation with its principal
21 place of business in Atlanta, Georgia.

22 15. Defendant Validity, Inc. is a Delaware corporation with its principal place
23 of business in Boston, Massachusetts.

24 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

25 16. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §
26 1332(d)(2)(A), as amended by the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 ("CAFA"), because
27 this case is a class action where the aggregate claims of all members of the proposed class
28

1 are in excess of \$5,000,000.00, exclusive of interest and costs, and there are over 100
2 members of the putative class, and Plaintiffs, as well as most members of the proposed
3 class, are citizens of different states than Defendants.

4 17. The Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because Defendants
5 conduct business in Arizona.

6 18. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because
7 Defendant resides in this District and is doing business and has a place of business in this
8 District. Venue is also proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because a
9 substantial part of the events and a substantial part of the omissions giving rise to the
10 claims in this case occurred in this District.

11 **Facts Supporting Plaintiff's Claims**

12 **A. Email Spy Pixels**

13 19. Despite Arizona law prohibiting the practice, companies embed trackers
14 within emails without first obtaining Arizonans' consent. Indeed, "[a] 2018 Princeton
15 study on email tracking tested over 12,000 emails from 900 senders offering mailing list
16 subscriptions and found that 70% contained trackers."¹

17 20. These trackers are known as "spy pixels."

18 21. A spy pixel is typically a 1x1 (one pixel high by one pixel long) image.
19 "The spy pixel is so small it is basically impossible to see with the naked eye."²
20

21
22
23 ¹ Mikael Berner, *The Business of Email Tracking: What To Know About Spy Pixels In Your Inbox*,
24 FORBES (Jun 9, 2022), [https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbestechcouncil/2022/06/09/the-business-of-](https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbestechcouncil/2022/06/09/the-business-of-email-tracking-what-to-know-about-spy-pixels-in-your-inbox/?sh=2084ee793fec)
25 [email-tracking-what-to-know-about-spy-pixels-in-your-inbox/?sh=2084ee793fec](https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbestechcouncil/2022/06/09/the-business-of-email-tracking-what-to-know-about-spy-pixels-in-your-inbox/?sh=2084ee793fec).

26 ² Becky Willeke, *Spy pixels are hiding in your emails; so what can you do about it?*, FOX 2 NOW (Mar.
27 15, 2021), [https://fox2now.com/news/tech-talk/spy-pixels-are-hiding-in-your-emails-so-what-can-you-](https://fox2now.com/news/tech-talk/spy-pixels-are-hiding-in-your-emails-so-what-can-you-do-about-it/)
28 [do-about-it/](https://fox2now.com/news/tech-talk/spy-pixels-are-hiding-in-your-emails-so-what-can-you-do-about-it/).

1 22. A spy pixel is deliberately made small and impossible to spot with the
2 naked eye even if a person knows where to look.

3 23. An email spy pixel is a tiny pixel graphic used to measure various metrics
4 while gathering information about email recipients.

5 24. The minuscule size of a spy pixel makes it almost invisible and enables it
6 to blend in with the background of an email. This is intentional, as tracking pixels (i.e.,
7 spy pixels) are designed to go unseen.

8 25. The objective of a spy pixel is to collect information without the knowledge
9 of the recipient of the email.

10 26. The spying effect is that, without the email recipient choosing to do so, the
11 result of opening the email is to report to the sender of the email: if and when an email is
12 read, when (and how many times) it is read, the IP address and other unique identity
13 details of the computer or smartphone used to read the email, and from the latter, the
14 geographical location of the recipient.

15 27. To activate a spy pixel, recipients need only to open the email.

16 **B. Defendants' Spy Pixel Tracking**

17 28. Defendant Validity acquired the customer engagement and email tracking
18 company Return Path in 2019.³

19 29. Defendant Validity, using “the cutting-edge technology and functionality
20 of the Return Path Platform”, created Everest.

21 30. Defendants use Everest.

22 31. Everest is an email tracking system offered by Validity.⁴
23
24
25
26

27 ³ <https://www.validity.com/blog/validity-return-path-announcement/>

28 ⁴ <https://www.validity.com/everest/>

1 32. Validity markets Everest by stating, among other things, that “Validity
2 Everest is the email deliverability platform that provides crucial insights and guidance so
3 you can reach more people, increase engagement, and protect your email performance.”⁵

4 33. With Everest, Defendants can “[u]nderstand the time of day your emails
5 are opened, what devices they are opened on, and how long people are looking at them.”⁶

6 34. Everest also gives Defendants the ability to “[f]ilter [their] engagement data
7 by mailbox provider, platform, location, and more to understand high- and low-
8 performing segments.”⁷

9 35. According to Validity, Everest allows companies to “[g]et a complete view
10 of [their] email performance to drive strategic decisions.”⁸ This is done by procuring
11 “engagement data” and combining it into “a single interface” to “drill down into
12 performance by mailbox provider.”⁹

13 36. Everest users, including Home Depot, create an “Everest tracking pixel” to
14 capture “engagement data.”

15 37. “The Everest tracking pixel has the ability to record recipients or values
16 associated with those recipients, individual email campaigns, and additional custom
17 properties via what are commonly referred to as merge tags or personalization tokens.”⁵⁷

18 38. With a personalization token, a company or person can “collect
19 engagement data” on individual email recipients.¹⁰
20
21
22

23 ⁵ <https://www.validity.com/everest/#more-messages>

24 ⁶ <https://www.validity.com/everest/engagement-analytics/>

25 ⁷ *Id.*

26 ⁸ *Id.*

27 ⁹ *Id.*

28 ¹⁰ *Id.*

39. The “engagement data” Everest collects includes average read time of an email, the amount of times an email was opened, unique opens per email address, whether an email was printed, whether an email was forwarded, and how long the recipient looked at the email.¹¹

40. Defendants use Everest to procure all “engagement data” record information with its tracking pixel.

41. Defendants embed a second tracking pixel that contains unique spy pixel URLs—personalization tokens—for each email it sends.

42. This second tracking pixel enables Defendants to track “engagement data” for every email recipient on an individual level.

43. This second tracking pixel can be seen in a snippet of the HTML code in one of Defendant Home Depot’s emails.

```
<img src=3D"https://trk.mg.homedepot.com/o/4/eyJhaSI6MjY2NzI0NDQsImUiOiJrYX=
NpZmtob3dhamFAZ21haWwY29tIiwicmkiOiI1MjIyMzgyNyIsInJxIjoIMDI0tYjIyMjkyLTVjN=
zE1NmYwYzZhNjQxODQ4ZDYyZDNkMmYxZDh1NGZhIiwicGgiOm51bGx9/0z9ycojNxIJ9laHHXR7=
Hpg" width=3D"1" height=3D"1">
<img src=3D"https://pixel.app.returnpath.net/pixel.gif?r=[REDACTED]=
[REDACTED]" width=3D"1" height=3D"1" style=3D"display:none">
<img src=3D"http://homedepot.demdex.net/event?d_dpuid=3D3038&d_dpuuid=3D=
[REDACTED]_sid=[REDACTED]" width=3D"1" height=3D"1" style=3D"display:non=
e">
```

44. Defendants embedded a spy pixel (one pixel high by one pixel long) in marketing emails Defendant Home Depot sent to Plaintiff and Defendants utilized the tracking system provided by Everest to track, among other things, the time and place of where the emails were opened.

45. Plaintiff was unaware that tracking pixels were embedded in the emails sent to her by Defendants.

¹¹ <https://knowledge.validity.com/hc/en-us/articles/4403870401563-Everest-Engagement-Playbook-Beginner>

1 46. Defendants never received lawful and valid consent from Plaintiff to use
2 these spy pixels.

3 47. Defendants never received lawful and valid consent from Class Members
4 to use these spy pixels.

5 **Arizona’s Telephone, Utility and Communication Service Records Act**
6 **A.R.S. § 44-1376**

7 48. A.R.S. § 44-1376 *et seq.* prohibits procurement of any “communication
8 service record” (including email records) of “any resident of this state without the
9 authorization of the customer to whom the record pertains, or by fraudulent, deceptive,
10 or false means.” A.R.S. § 44-1376.01.

11 49. A.R.S. § 44-1376 (1) defines “communication service record” as follows:
12 “‘Communication service record’ includes subscriber information, including name,
13 billing or installation address, length of service, payment method, telephone number,
14 electronic account identification and associated screen names, toll bills or access logs,
15 records of the path of an electronic communication between the point of origin and the
16 point of delivery and the nature of the communication service provided, such as caller
17 identification, automatic number identification, voice mail, electronic mail, paging or
18 other service features. Communication service records do not include the content of any
19 stored oral, wire or electronic communication or a telephone record.”
20

21 50. A.R.S. 44-1376.04(A)(2) allows Arizona residents to pursue civil causes of
22 action and civil remedies. Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 44-1376.04(A)(2).

23 51. A.R.S. 44-1376.04(A)(2) states that “[i]n a civil action, a customer whose
24 communication service records were procured, sold or received in violation of this article
25 may recover from the person that committed the violation the following relief...2.
26 Damages equal to the sum of the actual damages suffered by the plaintiff and any profits
27 made by the violator as a result of the violation but in no case shall a person entitled to
28 recover received less than one thousand dollars.”

Class Action Allegations

52. Plaintiff seeks to represent a class (the “Class” or “Class Members”) defined as: All persons in the State of Arizona who have opened a marketing email containing a tracking pixel from Defendants.

53. Excluded from the Class are Defendants, its subsidiaries, affiliates, officers, directors, assigns and successors, and any entity in which it has a controlling interest, and the Judge to whom this case is assigned and any member of his or her immediate family.

54. Class Members are so numerous that their individual joinder herein is impracticable. On information and belief, members of the Class number in the tens of thousands and possibly more. The precise number of Class Members and their identities are unknown to Plaintiff at this time but will be determined through discovery.

55. Class Members may be notified of the pendency of this action by email, mail and/or publication through the distribution records of Defendant and third-party retailers and vendors.

56. Common questions of law and fact exist as to all Class members and predominate over questions affecting only individual Class members. Common legal and factual questions include, but are not limited to:

a) whether Defendants “[k]nowingly procure[d], attempt[ed] to procure, solicit[ed] or conspire[d] with another to procure a ... communication service record of any resident of this state without the authorization of the customer to whom the record pertains or by fraudulent, deceptive or false means” ;

b) whether Plaintiff’s and the Class’s “communication service records” were procured, sold or received in violation of A.R.S. § 44-1376 *et seq.*

c) whether Defendants’ conduct violates A.R.S. § 44-1376 *et seq.* or any other applicable laws; and

1 d) whether, as a result of Defendants' misconduct as alleged herein, Plaintiff
2 and Class Members are entitled to restitution, injunctive, and/or monetary relief
3 and, if so, the amount and nature of such relief.

4 57. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of Class Members because
5 Plaintiff, like all Class Members, had her communication service records procured, sold,
6 or received by Defendants.

7 58. Plaintiff is an adequate representative of the Class because her interests do
8 not conflict with the interests of the Class she seeks to represent, she has retained counsel
9 competent and experienced in prosecuting class actions, and she intends to prosecute this
10 action vigorously. The interests of Class Members will be fairly and adequately protected
11 by Plaintiff and their counsel.

12 59. The class mechanism is superior to other available means for the fair and
13 efficient adjudication of the claims of Plaintiff and Class Members. Each individual Class
14 Member may lack the resources to undergo the burden and expense of individual
15 prosecution of the complex and extensive litigation necessary to establish Defendant's
16 liability.

17 60. Individualized litigation increases the delay and expense to all parties and
18 multiplies the burden on the judicial system presented by the complex legal and factual
19 issues of this case.

20 61. Individualized litigation also presents a potential for inconsistent or
21 contradictory judgments. In contrast, the class action device presents far fewer
22 management difficulties and provides the benefits of single adjudication, economy of
23 scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court on the issue of Defendants'
24 liability.

25 62. Class treatment of the liability issues will ensure that all claims and
26 claimants are before this Court for consistent adjudication of the liability issues.
27
28

1 70. Defendants acted deceptively because they never informed Plaintiff and
2 Class Members that Defendants would be procuring sensitive information including, but
3 not limited to, time logs of email access, associated email addresses, email client type,
4 location information, email path data, IP addresses, and device information.

5 71. Plaintiff and Class Members never gave lawful and valid consent to
6 Defendants to procure the communication service records.

7 72. Each time Defendants sent an email containing a spy pixel to Plaintiff and
8 Class Members, Defendants procured a communication service record, thus committing
9 a separate violation of A.R.S. § 44-1376.01.

10 73. Defendants invaded Plaintiff's and Class Members' right to privacy by
11 spying on them when they opened and read an email. That conduct also intruded upon
12 their seclusion.

13 74. Accordingly, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of the proposed Class,
14 prays for the relief set forth by the statute, including actual damages, profits made by
15 Defendants as a result of the violation, \$1,000 for each violation, reasonable attorneys'
16 fees and other litigation costs reasonably incurred, and such other equitable relief as the
17 court determines to be appropriate.

18 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly
19 situated, seeks judgement against Defendants, as follows:

- 20
- 21 a. For an order certifying the Class under Fed. R. Civ. P 23 and naming
22 Plaintiff as representative of the Class and Plaintiff's attorneys as Class
23 Counsel to represent the Class members;
 - 24 b. For an order declaring that Defendants' conduct, as set out above,
25 violates A.R.S. § 44- 1376.01;
 - 26 c. For an order finding in favor of Plaintiff and the Class on all counts
27 asserted herein;
 - 28 d. For actual damages or damages of \$1,000.00 for each of Defendants'
violations, whichever is more, pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-1376.04;

- 1
- 2 e. For damages equal to the sum of any profits Defendants made for each
- 3 of Defendants' violations, pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-1376.04;
- 4 f. For injunctive and other equitable relief as is necessary to protect the
- 5 interests of the Class, including, *inter alia*, an order requiring
- 6 Defendants to comply with A.R.S. § 44-1376 *et seq.*
- 7 g. For an order awarding Plaintiff and the Class their reasonable attorneys'
- 8 fees and expenses and costs of suit;
- 9 h. For pre- and post-judgment interest on all amounts awarded, to the
- 10 extent allowable; and
- 11 i. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem proper.

12 **Jury Demand**

13 Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all causes of action and issues so triable.

14 Dated: March 29, 2024

15 Respectfully submitted,

16 Ivonne V. Carbajal, individually and on behalf

17 of a collective of persons similarly situated.

18 /s/ James X. Bormes

19 James X. Bormes
20 (*pro hac vice* admission pending)
Illinois State Bar No. 620268
21 Catherine P. Sons
22 (*pro hac vice* admission pending)
Illinois State Bar No. 6202568 (480) 889-8951
23 LAW OFFICE OF JAMES X. BORMES, P.C. mmatheson@mathesonlegal.com
24 Illinois State Bar No. 620268
8 South Michigan Avenue, Suite 2600
25 Chicago, Illinois 60603
26 (312) 201-0575
jxbormes@bormeslaw.com
27 cpsons@bormeslaw.com

LOCAL COUNSEL:
Michelle R. Matheson #019568
MATHESON & MATHESON, P.L.C.
15300 North 90th Street, Suite 550
Scottsdale, Arizona 85260

28 **LEAD ATTORNEY IN CHARGE FOR**

PLAINTIFF AND CLASS MEMBERS

Thomas M. Ryan
(*pro hac vice* admission pending)
Illinois State Bar No. 6273422
LAW OFFICE OF THOMAS M. RYAN, P.C.
35 East Wacker Drive, Suite 650
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(312) 726-3400
tom@tomryanlaw.com
Attorney for Plaintiff